DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 422 EA 014 578

AUTHOR White, James; Fallis, Anita

TITLE Vandalism Prevention Programs: A Case Study Approach.

INSTITUTION Ontario Dept. of Education, Toronto.; Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Toronto.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-7743-6951-5
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 83p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8, CANADA ($4.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Pilot Projects; *Prevention; *School Vandalism; Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to identify, describe, and appraise existing behavior-oriented, vandalism-prevention programs using a case-study approach. This report summarizes an investigation of three programs in Ontario (Canada): Project PRIDE (Pupils Responsible in Determining their own Environment); Operation Aware; and a Diversion program. The general research methods are outlined and detailed descriptions and assessment of each program are given. Project PRIDE was implemented in a school system composed of 45 elementary schools and 10 secondary schools. The major component of the project is a financial incentive in which an account is established for each school on the basis of student enrollment. Costs incurred as a result of vandalism are subtracted from the fund and the balance given to the student council at the end of the school year. Operation Aware is an awareness program designed to teach grade 5 and 6 students what to expect from their peers as they mature and how to cope with negative peer influence. Five Ontario school boards adopted Operation Aware as a pilot program. The Diversion program's purpose is to evaluate young offenders and postpone or prevent their entry into the formal criminal justice system. The Waterloo County Board of Education has been involved in eight Diversion cases. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216422

VANDALISM PREVENTION PROGRAMS: A CASE STUDY APPROACH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B.M. Hildebrand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JAMES WHITE, Principal Investigator
ANITA FALLIS, Associate Investigator

This research was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

EA 014 578

Hon. Bette Stephenson, M.D., Minister
Harry K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

Ontario
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Colleges and Universities

© The Minister of Education, Ontario, 1981
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION

White, James.
Vandalism prevention programs: a case study approach / by James White and Anita Fallis. --

"This research was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario."

Includes bibliographical references.

1. School vandalism - Ontario. I. Fallis, Anita. II. Ontario. Ministry of Education. III. Title.

ON01881 371.58 UTLAS: 54018225

ISBN 0-7743-6951-5

Additional copies may be ordered from:

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

or from: (mail orders)

The Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

Publications Centre
880 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank the staff of the boards and schools who provided assistance and granted personal interviews for this study. The boards involved were: Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education; Lakehead Board of Education; Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board; Lincoln County Board of Education; and Waterloo County Board of Education. Special thanks are extended to Mr. Gib Taylor, Lakehead Board of Education.

Any errors or omissions in this report are the responsibility of the authors.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Research Methods	2
Identifying Programs	2
Collecting Data	3
PROJECT PRIDE	5
Introduction	6
Background	6
Description	6
Implementation	9
Assessment	10
Financial Analysis	10
Perceptions of Participants	13
Achievement of Goals	14
First-Year Problems and Difficulties	19
Implementation	19
Administration and operation	20
Positive Results of Project PRIDE	23
Negative Results of Project PRIDE	25
Conclusions	26
OPERATION AWARE	29
Introduction	30
Description of Operation Aware	31
The Programs	31
Grade 5 Program	31
Grade 6 Program	32
Parent Rap Sessions	33
Evaluation	34
Cost of Programs	34
Operation Aware Workshops	35
Training	35
Instructors	36
Operation Aware in Relation to Vandalism Prevention	37
Operation Aware in Ontario	38
Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education	38
Lakehead Boards of Education	40
Lincoln County Board of Education	41
Assessment	41
Positive Aspects	43
Possible outcomes	43
Students' evaluation	44
Teachers' perceptions	47
Negative Aspects	48
Administration	48
Operation Aware program	48
Feasibility of implementing the program	49
Recommendations	50

DIVERSION 51
Introduction 52
Diversion in Canada 52
Waterloo Region Diversion Program 53
Waterloo County Board of Education 55
Involvement in diversion 55
Assessment 56
Recommendations 57

SUMMARY 59

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 71

APPENDIX 1 - Project PRIDE Materials 73

INTRODUCTION

The prevention of school vandalism has been a concern of the Ministry of Education for several years. Two studies investigating vandalism-prevention measures have been completed for the ministry by InfoResults Limited during the past two years. The resulting report, School Vandalism: Problems and Responses, (White and Fallis), reviewed the literature on school vandalism-prevention programs implemented by school systems in Canada and the United States. Procedures that educators might use to reduce break-ins, theft, and damage were outlined.

As a follow-up to the above study, a survey of vandalism-prevention measures used in Ontario schools was conducted in 1979. The report, Vandalism-Prevention Programs Used in Ontario Schools (White and Fallis), provided data both on the frequency with which vandalism-prevention measures are being used and on their effectiveness as perceived by the principals. These two studies provided an overview of the status of vandalism prevention in the Ontario educational system.

The present research project was designed to identify and assess alternative, student-oriented, vandalism-prevention programs. The focus has been on programs which modify the behaviour of students. The objective of the study was to identify, describe, and appraise existing behaviour-oriented programs using a case-study approach. An investigation of such physical-plant-related measures as installation of alarms, "hardening" of the building, etc., was not a component of this study. This project was viewed as a necessary step before the development of a comprehensive vandalism-prevention program.

This report summarizes an investigation of three programs: Project PRIDE (Pupils Responsible in Determining their own Environment); Operation Aware; and a Diversion program. The general research methods are outlined, and detailed descriptions and assessments of each program are given.

RESEARCH METHODS

Identifying Programs

Behaviour-oriented programs were identified from the responses and comments on the principals' questionnaires used for the 1979 school survey. The behaviour-related measures listed in this questionnaire included: encouraging positive staff-student relationships; requiring restitution by the vandals in money or work; prosecution of vandals; and use of vandalism-prevention materials, pride programs, and incentive funds. The following programs were identified:

1. Lakehead Board of Education - Project PRIDE
2. North York Board of Education - an incentive fund
3. A public school in Scarborough - a pride program
4. A public school in Bruce County - a privilege-badge system
5. A high school in Waterloo County - a diversion program
6. A public school in York Borough - a school beautification campaign
7. Halton Board of Education - a film on vandalism in co-operation with the police force
8. Lincoln County Board of Education and the public- and separate-school boards in both Fort Frances-Rainy River and the Thunder Bay area - Operation Aware

The Ministry of Education contacted these boards and/or schools to seek permission to assess their programs. Two programs were selected for detailed investigation: Project PRIDE (Lakehead Board of Education); and Operation Aware (Lincoln County Board of Education, Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education, Lakehead Board of Education and Lakehead District Roman Catholic Board of Education). The effects of the Waterloo County Board of Education's participation in the Diversion program operated by the Ministry of Community and Social Services were also studied.

It should be noted that these three programs, which were implemented during the 1979 school year, were considered as pilot programs by the boards involved, so that a rigorous program evaluation was not feasible at this stage. We therefore undertook to describe and assess the programs with the full understanding that they were at an experimental, trial-and-error stage.

For various reasons, the other programs listed here were not selected to form part of this study. The vandalism school survey reported that eighty-nine schools used an incentive fund during 1978-79. The majority of these schools were part of the North York Board of Education, and this school system preferred that an evaluation not be conducted at this time. Also, the elementary school in the Scarborough Board did not believe their pride program was significant enough to warrant study.

Collecting Data

A case-study approach was used to analyse and assess the programs. Much of the information was collected through informal interviews with the participants. The nature of the study required a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach. Much of the information collected was based on the interviewer's perceptions, and this should be remembered when considering this report's conclusions.

The school systems were very interested in the appraisal of the programs. Without their excellent help and co-operation, collection of the data would not have been possible. The Lakehead Board of Education formed a committee to monitor Project PRIDE closely and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of it. Most of the data on this program reported herein were generated by the board. The data-collection procedures used for each program will be described in more detail in the relevant chapters.

PROJECT PRIDE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Lakehead Board of Education initiated Project PRIDE (Pupils Responsible in Determining their own Environment) in their school system in September 1979. The school system is composed of forty-five elementary schools, accommodating approximately 12,300 students, and ten secondary schools, handling 9,000 students. The program developed by the board is totally independent of the Project Pride (A Positive Approach to Vandalism) which originated in San Bruno, California, in 1976. The American program has been described in the White and Fallis report School Vandalism: Problems and Responses.

The Lakehead Board's program was designed to operate throughout the 1979-80 school year and to be evaluated at its end. An evaluation committee, consisting of three school principals and the board's research director, was formed. The program, of local and provincial interest, was perceived by the board to complement the Chamber of Commerce's "Beautify Thunder Bay" project and the work of the City of Thunder Bay's vandalism committee.

During the past few years, the Lakehead Board of Education has implemented a number of measures to reduce vandalism. The measures have included: installing a centrally monitored, silent-alarm motion-detector system; replacing glass with polycarbonates; fitting windows with wire-mesh screens; reducing access to roofs; installing steel doors; and taking vandalism prevention into consideration in the design of new additions. Most of the measures were physical-plant or procedure oriented.

Description

Project PRIDE can be described as a behaviour-oriented vandalism-prevention program. It was viewed as an attempt to involve students in reducing vandalism and as a means of instilling in the students a sense of pride in and responsibility for the condition of their school building and grounds.

The stated goals of Project PRIDE are:[1]

1. To develop a sense of pride within the students themselves.

2. To increase the awareness in students that vandalism costs money.

3. To have students take more responsibility for the care and cleanliness of their school and school grounds.

4. To provide a potential financial resource for the students' council.

5. To ensure that repairs required as a result of vandalism are completed immediately.

6. To prevent the spread of damage to property as a result of vandalism.

7. To ensure the school grounds are free of litter and garbage.

The major component of Project PRIDE is a financial-incentive program. A fund or PRIDE Account was established for every elementary and secondary school in the Lakehead Board. The costs incurred as a result of vandalism were to be subtracted from the fund and the balance given to the students' council or equivalent at the end of the school year. The student group, in consultation with the principal, was to determine the disposition of the monies or PRIDE Dollars.

The account was established with funds from the regular vandalism budget. During the 1978-79 school year, the Lakehead Board spent $34,876 on the repair or replacement of vandalized school property. This figure includes the cost of labour and materials to replace broken glass, repair any external or internal damage caused by vandalism or theft. Costs incurred as a result of arson were not included. The

---

1. Memo to The Chairman and Members of The Resources Management Committee from The Lakehead Board of Education (May 18, 1979).

PRIDE Account for every school was established on the basis of student enrolment as of September 30, 1979. Using the 1978-79 figure for vandalism costs, the budget allocation was $2.00 per secondary student and $1.50 per elementary student.

The operational procedures of the program were as follows:

1. Each school was assigned a code number and an outline of the procedures required to charge items to the PRIDE Account.

2. All repairs to vandalized school property, including the cost of material and labour, were to be charged to the PRIDE Account. This included such things as: replacing broken glass; replacing broken furniture, lockers, etc.; painting and repairing defaced walls; cleaning up the school grounds; and any other repairs necessitated by acts of vandalism.

3. Costs of up to $300 per occurrence for external damage caused by vandalism were to be charged to the PRIDE Account.

4. The condition of the school building and grounds was to be evaluated on a weekly basis by the principal and the student representatives.

5. The principal was to initiate any action necessary to repair an act of vandalism or clean-up the school grounds within forty-eight hours. Repairs might be made by:

a) the school custodian (labour for repairs carried out by the custodian during regular working hours would not be charged to the account);
b) the board's maintenance department;
c) outside contractual sources;
d) the students.

6. Any reimbursement of costs from responsible parties or insurance claims was to be credited to the account.

7. No school was to be penalized if the PRIDE Account exceeded the budget allotment.

8. All monies remaining in the PRIDE Account as of the first of June were to be turned over to the students' council. The students' council, in consultation with its staff advisor and the principal was to determine how the PRIDE Dollars would be spent. In elementary schools (where there is no students' council) a representative group of students, in consultation with the principal, were to make the decision.

Implementation

The Lakehead Board of Education resources-management-policy committee approved Project PRIDE in June 1979. The project was introduced at a principals' meeting by the director of the board. Each school was supplied with the following Project PRIDE materials:

1. a suggested form to use for the weekly school evaluation;

2. pamphlets outlining the program, its goals, and its guidelines for distribution to students;

3. a poster describing the program;

4. a PRIDE Account poster, referred to as a barometer, with spaces provided to write in the number of consecutive days without any vandalism and the amount of money in the PRIDE Account.

Apart from these materials and guidelines, the actual methods of implementing the program at the school level were decided by the principals.

The accounting procedures of the board's business department were modified to include charges made against a school's PRIDE Account. These charges were forwarded to the schools on a monthly basis. In this way, a vandalism-reporting system was established which showed total vandalism costs for each school and for the system as a whole.

The project was viewed as very inexpensive to operate. Apart from the cost of printing the materials (which was done internally) the major expenditure was of the administrative time required for the accounting procedures and evaluation of the project.

ASSESSMENT

A comprehensive evaluation of Project PRIDE was undertaken during May and June 1980 by a committee consisting of three school principals (two from elementary schools; one from a secondary school) and the board's research director. InfoResults Limited assisted the committee in designing its questionnaire, participated in the collection of data, and conducted informal interviews with board personnel and principals. The data collected was of two major types: financial statistics; and perceptions of board personnel, school staff, and students.

Financial Analysis

A summary of each school's PRIDE Account balance was prepared by the board.[2] For details, see Table 1. Just over half the amount (52.6 per cent) of the 1978-79 vandalism budget of $34,876 was returned to the schools on June 1, 1980. The 1979-80 vandalism costs totalled $18,326, leaving a balance of $18,474 payable to the schools.[3]

The prevention of vandalism involves a combination of factors. It would be an oversimplification to attribute the greatly reduced level of the 1979-80 vandalism costs entirely to Project PRIDE. Physical-plant procedures may reduce vandalism rates. However, to our knowledge, the Lakehead Board did not, that year, implement any new hardware procedures which would have contributed to the lower costs of vandalism during 1979-80.

---

2. In order to distribute the monies to the schools on June 1, 1980, the accounting office closed its records on May 23. Any charges incurred from this date to June 1, were to be charged to the schools' 1980-81 PRIDE Account.

3. $1,924 was subtracted from the 1979-80 vandalism costs. This represents the amount of money spent on vandalism repair which exceeded the PRIDE Accounts of four schools.

Table 1, Part I: Summary of PRIDE Account - Elementary Schools

Schools	Original budget	1979-80 costs	Balance	% of budget returned
1	848	271	577	68.0
2	723	1603	-	-
3	477	227	250	52.4
4	399	187	212	53.1
5	140	36	104	74.3
6	612	222	390	63.7
7	464	382	82	17.7
8	260	-	260	100.0
9	291	147	144	49.5
10	395	33	362	91.7
11	186	79	107	57.5
12	444	22	422	95.1
13	347	-	347	100.0
14	666	335	331	49.7
15	197	-	197	100.0
16	306	20	286	93.5
17	147	92	55	37.4
18	297	102	195	65.7
19	236	110	126	53.4
20	594	-	594	100.0
21	389	-	389	100.0
22	138	-	138	100.0
23	419	-	419	100.0
24	563	142	421	74.8
25	114	-	114	100.0
26	507	272	235	46.4
27	360	-	360	100.0
28	267	538	-	-
29	428	108	320	74.8
30	386	-	386	100.0
31	327	35	292	89.3
32	282	259	23	8.2
33	368	95	273	74.2
34	128	-	128	100.0
35	203	179	24	11.8
36	174	164	10	5.8
37	314	184	130	41.4
38	786	247	539	68.6
39	449	395	54	12.0
40	449	-	449	100.0
41	221	74	147	66.5
42	575	301	274	47.7
43	165	-	165	100.0
44	428	78	350	81.8
45	357	27	330	92.4
	16826	6966	11011	65.4

Table 1, Part II: Summary of PRIDE Account - Secondary Schools

Schools	Original budget	1979-80 costs	Balance	% of budget returned
1	1472	170	1302	88.5
2	1022	1127	-	-
3	2562	913	1649	64.4
4	2180	1095	1085	49.8
5	1842	1389	453	24.6
6	1012	1680	-	-
7	1316	495	821	62.4
8	2268	1496	772	34.0
9	2154	1789	365	17.0
10	2222	1206	1016	45.7
	18050	11360	7463	41.4
Totals				
All Schools	$34876	$18326	$18474	53.0

A finding from the principals' questionnaire lends support to the positive influence of Project PRIDE. Over one-quarter (27 per cent) of the principals perceived that vandalism by the student body was reduced during the school year in question. Half of these principals believed the reduction in vandalism was a result of Project PRIDE.

It is granted that not all factors which might have influenced the outcome have been quantified; nevertheless, the amount of money spent on vandalism repair was reduced by half. Separate analyses were done for elementary and secondary schools and for size of school enrolment.

The following general points about these figures should be noted. The project appears to have been more successful at the elementary- than at the secondary-school level in terms of the percentage of the original budget returned. Two-thirds (65.4 per cent) of the original amount allocated to the elementary schools was returned compared to two-fifths (41.4 per cent) of the secondary school budget. While thirteen of the forty-five elementary schools had no vandalism costs, none of the secondary schools was free of vandalism. The vandalism costs at two elementary and two high schools exceeded their PRIDE Accounts.

The percentage of the original budget returned to the schools varies substantially from school to school. An analysis was done by the number of students enrolled. The percentages returned to elementary schools with 200 or fewer students, 201 to 300 students and 301 or more students were 56.2, 83.4, and 57.1, respectively. Secondary schools with 500 to 1000 students and with 1000 or more students both received approximately two-fifths of their original budget.

Perceptions of Participants

The board's evaluation committee sent questionnaires to 258 principals, vice-principals, teachers, custodians, maintenance personnel, and secondary-school students to determine their perceptions of Project PRIDE. Group discussions were conducted with principals, with twenty elementary students from different schools, and with maintenance-department personnel. Selected board employees and three principals were personally interviewed by InfoResults Limited.

The topics investigated in the questionnaire included: the extent to which the goals of the project were being achieved; the administration of the program; positive and negative effects; plans for using the money disbursed; and the amount of school vandalism. A basic questionnaire, with modifications for the various respondents, was designed. For example, the students selected (but not the principals) were asked to describe how well motivated their student body was in keeping the PRIDE Account from being depleted.

Each principal was asked to complete a questionnaire and distribute questionnaires to one or more teacher(s), a vice-principal (if applicable), and a custodian. Two students from each secondary school were given questionnaires. A pamphlet describing Project PRIDE and a covering letter from the evaluation committee were enclosed with each survey form. All respondents were assured of anonymity.

Out of the 258 questionnaires distributed, 177 were returned, giving a response rate of 68.6 per cent. The number of completed questionnaires by type of respondent was: principals, thirty-seven; vice-principals, thirty; teachers, including department heads, fifty-five; custodians, thirty-seven; and students, eighteen.

Achievement of Goals

The respondents were asked to indicate what progress they believed had been made towards reaching each of the seven goals of Project PRIDE. The goals were listed as: to develop pride within the students; to teach students that vandalism costs money; to have students take more responsibility for the care and cleanliness of the school; to provide a potential source of funds for the students' council; to ensure that property damaged by vandalism was repaired immediately; to prevent the spread of vandalism; and to keep the school grounds free of litter and garbage.

The responses from the interviewees with regard to each goal were summarized to create an over-all goal-achievement index.[4] Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of the respondents perceived some progress towards the goals of Project PRIDE; 13 per cent did not perceive progress; 8 per cent did not know; and 7 per cent did not give an answer. In terms of the specific response categories, 15 per cent perceived a great deal of progress, one-third (32 per cent) perceived moderate progress, and one-quarter (25 per cent) slight progress.

It was felt that more progress had been made towards teaching students that vandalism costs money than towards any of the other goals. As Table 2 shows, 84 per cent of the respondents felt that slight, moderate, or great progress had been made towards realizing this goal. Approximately three-quarters perceived some progress towards three goals - to develop pride in students, 76.3 per cent; to ensure damage was repaired immediately, 75.2 per cent; and to have students take responsibility for the care of the school, 74.1 per cent. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents felt progress had been made towards realizing each of the remaining three goals - to provide funds for the students' council, 65.5 per cent; to prevent the spread of vandalism, 65.0 per cent; and to keep the school clean, 63.3 per cent.

Table 2 also illustrates the extent to which each goal is perceived as being achieved by each particular type of respondent. It is interesting to note that school staff felt more progress had been made towards the goals involving the students (to develop pride, to make students aware of vandalism costs, to encourage students to take responsibility for the care of the school) than the students did. However, the student responses did not include elementary students. Another important finding was that the majority of the custodians felt the goals pertaining to school maintenance were being achieved.

---

4. The total number of responses (177) was multiplied by the number of questions (7) giving 1,239. The replies were totalled by type of respondent for each response category and the resulting figures were divided by 1,239. For example, 186 responses were totalled for "a great deal". Dividing 1239 into 186 gave a figure of 0.15, indicating that 15 per cent of the respondents felt "a great deal" of progress had been made.

   These calculations were undertaken by the Project PRIDE Evaluation Committee and provided to the research consultant.

Table 2: Extent Goals of Project PRIDE Are Being Achieved, by Type of Respondent

Goals	Principals		Vice principals		Teachers		Custodians		High-school students		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Develop a sense of pride within the students												
A great deal	-	-	1	3.3	5	9.1	4	10.8	1	5.6	11	6.2
Moderately	13	35.1	13	43.4	25	45.4	11	29.8	2	11.1	64	36.2
Slightly	14	37.9	10	33.3	16	29.1	11	29.7	9	49.9	60	33.9
Not at all	1	2.7	3	10.0	4	7.3	3	8.1	3	16.7	14	7.9
Don't know	8	21.6	1	3.3	2	3.6	6	16.2	2	11.1	19	10.7
No answer	1	2.7	2	6.7	3	5.5	2	5.4	1	5.6	9	5.1
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0
Teach students that vandalism costs money												
A great deal	8	21.6	6	20.0	15	27.3	6	16.2	3	16.7	38	21.5
Moderately	17	46.0	14	46.7	21	38.1	12	32.5	2	11.1	66	37.3
Slightly	12	32.4	6	20.0	12	21.8	9	24.3	6	33.2	45	25.4
Not at all	-	-	1	3.3	4	7.3	2	5.4	5	27.8	12	6.8
Don't know	-	-	1	3.3	-	-	6	16.2	1	5.6	8	4.5
No answer	-	-	2	6.7	3	5.5	2	5.4	1	5.6	8	4.5
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Goals	Principals		Vice principals		Teachers		Custodians		High-school students		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have students take more responsibility in care & cleanliness of school												
A great deal	2	5.4	2	6.7	9	16.4	2	5.4	2	11.1	17	9.6
Moderately	13	35.2	13	43.3	17	30.8	15	40.6	6	33.3	64	36.2
Slightly	12	32.4	9	30.0	12	21.8	13	35.1	4	22.2	50	28.3
Not at all	8	21.6	3	10.0	10	18.2	5	13.5	5	27.8	31	17.5
Don't know	2	5.4	1	3.3	3	5.5	1	2.7	-	-	7	3.9
No answer	-	-	2	6.7	4	7.3	1	2.7	1	5.6	8	4.5
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0
Provide potential source of funds for students' council												
A great deal	10	27.0	5	16.7	13	23.6	4	10.8	6	33.2	38	21.5
Moderately	18	48.7	9	29.9	15	27.2	6	16.2	5	27.8	53	29.9
Slightly	6	16.2	6	20.0	5	9.1	5	13.5	3	16.7	25	14.1
Not at all	2	5.4	6	20.0	8	14.6	4	10.8	1	5.6	21	11.9
Don't know	1	2.7	2	6.7	8	14.6	12	32.5	2	11.1	25	14.1
No answer	-	-	2	6.7	6	10.9	6	16.2	1	5.6	15	8.5
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Goals	Principals		Vice principals		Teachers		Custodians		High-school students		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Ensure damage repaired immediately												
A great deal	8	21.6	5	16.7	16	29.1	14	37.9	5	27.8	48	27.1
Moderately	8	21.6	11	36.7	22	40.0	9	24.3	8	44.4	58	32.8
Slightly	11	29.8	8	26.7	2	3.6	6	16.2	-	-	27	15.3
Not at all	8	21.6	1	3.3	4	7.3	2	5.4	-	-	15	8.4
Don't know	1	2.7	1	3.3	7	12.7	2	5.4	3	16.7	14	7.9
No answer	1	2.7	4	13.3	4	7.3	4	10.8	2	11.1	15	8.5
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0
Prevent spread of vandalism												
A great deal	-	-	1	3.3	4	7.3	7	18.9	4	22.2	16	9.0
Moderately	9	24.3	8	26.7	13	23.6	7	18.9	4	22.2	41	23.2
Slightly	11	29.8	14	46.6	19	34.5	10	27.1	4	22.2	58	32.8
Not at all	4	10.8	3	10.0	4	7.3	6	16.2	4	22.2	21	11.9
Don't know	11	29.7	2	6.7	6	10.9	4	10.8	1	5.6	24	13.5
No answer	2	5.4	2	6.7	9	16.4	3	8.1	1	5.6	17	9.6
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0
Keep grounds free of litter												
A great deal	-	-	1	3.3	6	10.9	9	24.3	2	11.1	18	10.2
Moderately	7	18.9	8	26.7	16	29.0	11	29.8	6	33.3	48	27.1
Slightly	12	32.4	9	30.0	14	25.5	7	18.9	4	22.2	46	26.0
Not at all	14	37.9	9	30.0	14	25.5	5	13.5	4	22.2	46	26.0
Don't know	2	5.4	1	3.3	1	1.8	1	2.7	1	5.6	6	3.4
No answer	2	5.4	2	6.7	4	7.3	4	10.8	1	5.6	13	7.3
Total	37	100.0	30	100.0	55	100.0	37	100.0	18	100.0	177	100.0

The school-staff respondents were asked to comment on the goals of Project PRIDE. The majority of the comments were very positive and described the goals as realistic, valid, admirable, and well-defined. A few principals were opposed to the philosophy of the program which they expressed as "buying pride" or "rewarding for non-vandalism".

First Year Problems and Difficulties

Implementation

The principals were informed about Project PRIDE and given guidelines for its implementation. The manner in which the program was introduced at each school was at the discretion of the principal. Nevertheless, the implementation of the project caused the following types of difficulties and/or concerns at a few schools:

1. A minority of the principals felt that the project was imposed upon them.

2. One or two principals were opposed to the philosophy of the program.

3. A small minority of principals was concerned that the introduction of any project aimed at vandalism reduction would promote or increase vandalism.

4. The picture of young children on the pamphlet was perceived to be inappropriate for secondary-school students.

5. One or two elementary-school principals believed that their schools were being discriminated against because they received $1.50 per student compared to $2.00 per student for secondary schools.

6. The barometer displaying the PRIDE Account was viewed by a minority of principals as a negative instrument rather than as a vehicle for positive reinforcement.

7. The maintenance department was concerned that principals were instructed to hire outside agencies to complete repairs which maintenance could not do within forty-eight hours. In most cases, when repairs could not be completed within this time period, the unavailability of the necessary materials was the chief cause of delay. As it happened, independent contractors could not be hired to repair vandalism damage anyway, as a clause in the collective agreement with service workers limits the use of outside contractors.

8. A few school custodians claimed they were never fully informed about the project.

For the above reasons, the project was not fully implemented at all schools. In fact, one or two principals either did not introduce the program at all, or waited until the middle of the year to do so. At some schools, especially the secondary schools, the pamphlets were not distributed. However, it was never the intention that the program be implemented in the same fashion at every school. The board recognizes the different needs of the various schools within its jurisdiction.

At a majority of the schools, Project PRIDE was introduced over the public-address system during school assemblies, or by the students' council. It would appear that the program was not emphasized to any great extent, especially at the secondary-school level. The survey participants frequently reported a lack of information about the project.

Administration and operation

The administration of the program varied among the schools. At some schools, a Project PRIDE Committee, consisting of a teacher, a custodian, and several students, was responsible for evaluating the condition of the school premises. In other schools, the students' council and a staff advisor were responsible for the program's administration. A record of the charges against the school's PRIDE Account was forwarded to the school by the board's business department.

At several schools, it was felt that the communication between the board's business office and the school with regard to charges made against the PRIDE Account was the only functioning component of the program. In several schools, it was reported, although the barometer showing the PRIDE Account may have been posted, it was not kept up to date. Therefore, the PRIDE Account had low visibility at several schools.

The actual involvement of the schools with the program, apart from making the existence of the incentive fund known to students, is difficult to estimate. It would appear that the project was not greatly emphasized or promoted. A few teachers claimed they stressed the importance of pride in oneself and in the school during class lessons. Vandalism, the cost of repair, and the PRIDE Account were discussed in a few cases. A few principals cited examples of restitution either by the offender or by the student body to avoid charging the school's fund. However, the project did not appear to include rewarding the students or classes with badges, plaques, etc., as is done in the California Project Pride.

Several problems concerning the administration and operation of the program were outlined by the survey respondents. One of the major difficulties was the lack of a clear definition of school vandalism. Without an explanation of what constituted vandalism, some schools found it difficult to distinguish vandalism from accidental damage. Therefore, whether a charge should be made against a school's PRIDE Account was, in some instances, open to question. The need for a standard definition of vandalism was stressed.

Another difficulty arose from the fact that no individual was designated as the final authority on whether or not to charge a school's PRIDE Account. Criteria for the decision-making process were not fully documented. The principals, the board, and the maintenance personnel were all involved in the process. Several principals complained that charges were made to their PRIDE Account which they felt were not appropriate to the program. Others complained of not being consulted about charges to the account. Maintenance personnel, however, claimed that either they received a work order indicating that the PRIDE Account should be charged or they consulted with the principals about charges.

A third problem arose from the program's stated goal that damage from vandalism should be repaired within forty-eight hours. The board's maintenance program was not designed to meet this need. Maintenance personnel questioned whether all types of vandalism should be given equal priority since such an approach can interrupt the progress of other work. It was suggested that broken windows and certain types of graffiti receive priority for fast attention.

The principals and maintenance people seemed to feel that some revision and elaboration of the guidelines were called for. Maintenance personnel felt that the principals' expectation that repairs would be done within forty-eight hours was unrealistic, since certain types of damage cannot be repaired immediately. A few principals questioned why the repair of damage resulting from vandalism should take precedence over damage done accidentally.

The guidelines for charging external vandalism were also questioned. External school vandalism up to $300 was charged to a school's PRIDE Account, but damage to the exterior of a school often occurs after school hours and may not have been committed by a student from that school. Often external vandalism is quite extensive, involving broken windows which are expensive to replace. It is quite possible for a school, especially an elementary school, to lose its entire PRIDE account as a result of one act of vandalism. Also, schools used by the wider community may be subjected to more damage than non-community schools.

Some administrators expressed concern that the students might become discouraged, frustrated, and demoralized at losing their PRIDE Dollars when they were not responsible for the vandalism. The Lakehead Board's evaluation committee discussed this issue with twenty elementary students who viewed external vandalism as a misfortune but who could not see an alternative to charging a PRIDE Account.

John Zeisel's discussion, in Stopping School Property Damage, of the types of damage that should be charged to a student vandalism account is helpful in this regard. In his opinion, funds from an account should be used only for in-school intentional damage to the building

except when the damage is caused by major fires. In order to make the program fair to students, malicious property damage must be distinguished from normal wear and tear. Also only the costs of acts of vandalism which occur while school is in session should be deducted from the account. He states: "If students are held accountable for damage which occurs while they are not at school, the vandalism account may soon be depleted, and students will be punished for situations over which they have no control."[5]

Positive Results of Project PRIDE

Project PRIDE was perceived as producing several benefits for the students and the school. The vice-principals, teachers, and custodians were asked to describe briefly any benefits resulting from the projects. The following description outlines the positive aspects perceived. The perceived benefits closely resembled most of the goals of the program.

1. The program made funds available (the PRIDE Dollars) for a variety of useful purposes of direct benefit to the students.

One purpose of the incentive fund was to allow students to see the positive results of refraining from vandalism. It is important for the students to participate in deciding how to spend the money and actually to spend it. The Lakehead Board's program specified that the students' council or a representative group of students, in consultation with the principal, would determine how the PRIDE Dollars would be spent. Allowing a group of students to undertake this responsibility is probably the most practical approach. However, if only the student leaders choose a project, then many of the students who may be vandals are left out. It is suggested that an attempt should be made to involve the whole student body in the decision-making process.

---

5. Zeisel, John Stopping School Property Damage: Design and Administrative Guidelines To Reduce School Vandalism (New York and Washington, D.C.: Educational Facilities Labs., Inc., and American Association of School Administration, 1976).

The survey findings indicate that, at a majority of the schools, the students were involved in the decision-making process. Several principals stated that they plan to discuss the matter with the students' council. In our opinion, very few limitations should be put on the use of the funds. Only one principal in the survey stated that he and the students' council would have to compromise on the use of the funds.

A question that must be considered is that of when the students may spend the money. If student interest is to be maintained, visible results are desirable, so ideally the money should be spent at the end of the school year. This will also ensure that students leaving the school (e.g., the graduating class) see a reward for their efforts.

At the time of this survey, many schools had not decided how to use the money. In general, among those that had, the students felt that the money should be used for something all students could see and/or use and attribute to Project PRIDE. Several recreational and educational activities were made possible by the incentive fund. Some of the ways the money was used were:

- taking field trips (a roller skating outing, a camping trip, etc.)
- providing treats for parents and students at a picnic
- purchasing playground equipment
- offering prizes for a public-speaking contest
- purchasing library books
- establishing a scholarship fund
- depositing money in a reserve fund for the following year
- sharing money among the classes for their own use

2. The program created an awareness of and interest in vandalism and the costs of repairs among students, school staff, and parents. As a result of the reporting procedure required by the program, many schools learned of the costs of repairs for the first time. Establishing the vandalism-reporting system is, in itself, an achievement.

3. The program contributed to the cleanliness of the schools. The custodians, in particular, believed that the students were trying to keep the schools cleaner. Graffiti and gum wrappers became less apparent. The program led to increased co-operation between the students and the custodians.

4. The program ensured prompt maintenance service.

5. The program gave students a greater feeling of responsibility for making restitution for acts of vandalism.

6. The program encouraged students to volunteer information concerning instances of vandalism.

7. The program coincided with a reduction in vandalism in several schools, although this reduction could not be directly attributed to the project.

Negative Results of Project PRIDE

Almost all the survey participants (with the exception of the students) were asked to indicate any negative results, either actual or potential of Project PRIDE. The most frequent objection was to the deduction of PRIDE Dollars for vandalism committed by non-students outside school hours. Many respondents felt this was unfair to and frustrating for the students.

A number of respondents commented on the increase or potential increase in vandalism as a direct result of the project, suggesting that several factors might explain the increase. Students taking revenge on the school, students responding negatively to the publicity given to the project, and school rivalry were cited as reasons.

For example, one school experienced a serious act of vandalism by ex-students. It was felt that these students, who were aware of the fund, saw an opportunity to get revenge on the school. One vice-principal believed that some individuals sought to attain recognition through creating damage to undermine the project.

Some principals, who were reluctant to introduce the project for fear the publicity would promote vandalism, did not report an increase after the introduction of the project.

One or two acts of vandalism involving school rivalry were reported. One secondary-school student suggested that a communal high school fund might be established and used to pay for an all-school dance or concert at the end of the school year. The student felt that "by having all high schools responsible for all vandalism, perhaps students would not want to damage other schools, as it would ultimately affect them. This could foster a better relationship between the schools and could lessen existing animosities".

Conclusions

The Project PRIDE Program developed by the Lakehead Board of Education appears to have been successful during its first year. The majority of the school staff and students who participated in an evaluation of the project perceived that most of its goals were being achieved to some degree. The cost of vandalism was substantially reduced from $34,876 in 1979 to $18,326 in 1980. Only four schools out of fifty-five did not receive money from the incentive fund. The PRIDE Dollars were used by the students to support several school activities and projects.

The program emphasized the development of students' pride in themselves and their schools. The primary means for increasing student pride was an incentive fund. The whole program differs little from vandalism accounts operated in several other schools, but it does differ substantially from the California-based Project Pride, which includes badges, awards, and various plant- and community-related activities.

The fact that the vandalism costs in 1979-80 were only half those of the previous year is encouraging. However, the proportion of the reduction which one can directly attribute to the program cannot be determined. At some schools the program was not actually implemented or appears to have had very little impact.

Any program during its first year of operation is likely to experience difficulties, some of which cannot be anticipated and some of which develop as a result of the program. It is important to identify the problems so that modifications can be made. Most vandalism-prevention programs are never monitored or evaluated. The Lakehead Board of Education realized the importance of an evaluation and established a committee to investigate the program. Several implementation and administrative problems were identified, and these have been discussed in detail in this report. The board intends to review its program in the light of the evaluation in order to determine what modifications are necessary for Project PRIDE to run more smoothly during the 1980-81 school year.

It seems clear that the program made students aware of vandalism, and also that, in several schools, there was a significant reduction in the cost of vandalism. Many school staff were made aware, for the first time, of the actual dollar cost of vandalism. Prior to this program, the board had not kept detailed records of the cost of vandalism. Finally, it should be reiterated that the program is especially significant because it is one of the few attempts to reduce school vandalism by means of a behaviour-oriented program rather than a physical-plant-oriented program.

OPERATION AWARE

INTRODUCTION

Operation Aware is an awareness program designed to teach Grade 5 and 6 students what to expect from their peers as they mature and how to cope with negative peer influence. The approach is positive and involves various types of instruction. The material includes such subjects as: dating; juvenile procedure; drugs; stealing; and class-skipping. It also introduces such concepts as: being misled; "fronting" (a type of attention-getting device); problems; authority; and setting standards. The influence of peer pressure and how to deal with it is a key theme of the program.

The program was started in September 1976 in Duluth, Minnesota, at two Catholic schools. It has expanded into the public- and catholic-school systems in Duluth and into many schools throughout the United States. It was developed and is directed by Mr. Dan Celentano, a child-care worker with six years experience. Sister Marilyn Micke, Superintendent of Catholic Schools in the Diocese of Duluth, approved the program and is one of its administrators. Mr. Celentano and an assistant, Mr. Tim Johnson, have taught the program in Duluth during the past four years. Operation Aware is an incorporated company (1978) and is described as a non-profit organization. It provides training workshops and the materials necessary to conduct the program.

During the 1979-80 school year, five Ontario school boards adopted Operation Aware as a pilot program. The boards were: Lincoln County Board of Education; Lakehead Board of Education; Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board; Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education; and Fort Frances-Rainy River Roman Catholic Separate School Board. The project was sponsored by local Rotary clubs in all three cities.

InfoResults Limited investigated the Operation Aware programs being piloted in Ontario. Except for the separate-school board in Fort Frances, all the participating school boards were contacted. The main purpose of this research study was to describe and assess vandalism-prevention programs. Operation Aware, although not directly involved in vandalism prevention, was viewed as a possible preventive, behaviour-related approach to the problem of school vandalism.

This section of the report describes and evaluates the Operation Aware program as we understand it. At the time of writing, our letters to the American director of the program remained unanswered, so that the information regarding this program was obtained mainly through interviews with teachers and co-ordinators of the program, review of the available materials, and direct observation of an Operation Aware class.

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATION AWARE

Operation Aware was developed in response to the problems experienced by teenagers in the junior-high- and early high-school years. It was designed as a preventive program for Grade 5 and 6 students, to create awareness of problems that might confront them as teenagers and to teach them ways of handling these problems. It is intended to be an awareness program, not a drug or therapy program designed to instil fear in children.

The Programs

Operation Aware consists of two programs: one for Grade 5 students and a follow-up program for the same students in Grade 6. The programs differ slightly in terms of content and method of instruction. However, central to both are rap sessions during which the students discuss subjects in which negative peer pressure is the main theme. During these rap sessions, the students learn to identify, discuss, and question peer influence as well as to interact with each other. A rhetoric and terminology unique to Operation Aware is introduced to and used by the participants. The director stresses that the programs must be kept positive. A student's name must not be used within or outside the class as an example of any subject under discussion.

Grade 5 program

The Grade 5 program provides the students with a basic understanding of eight key subjects. It is a simplified form of the Grade 6 program. The subjects include: fronting; being misled; problems; class-skipping; stealing; authority; friends/buddy; and put-downs. Weekly

half-hour-long meetings are held over a period of three months. It is recommended that the Grade 5 program be run from March to April of the school year since it introduces the Grade 6 program.

The basic tool of the Grade 5 program is the rap session. A film strip with a cassette is shown after each rap session to illustrate what has been discussed. Verbal review and memory quizzes are used to reinforce what has been taught. The teacher is provided with a detailed manual and all the necessary accompanying materials.

Grade 6 Program

The Grade 6 program is an in-depth, four-month course, consisting of two half-hour-long sessions a week. The program utilizes four basic types of instruction: rap sessions; field trips; audio-visual sessions (movies/video tapes); and acting out sessions. During the rap sessions, the subjects from the Grade 5 program as well as drugs, dating, juvenile procedure, and setting standards are discussed. The teachers should use an approach which reviews and builds on what has been previously taught in Grade 5.

During these sessions, the students are encouraged to talk, give examples from their own experience, and ask questions. Review of the material is a fundamental requirement. Operation Aware, Inc., has produced nine 11 x 14" photographs which illustrate the concepts of fronting, being misled, dealing with problems, and put-downs. Various techniques for using the photographs are suggested.

Field trips to institutions dealing with juvenile crime are an integral aspect of the Grade 6 program. The purpose of the trips is to make the students aware of what they can expect if they choose to make wrong decisions. Approximately four trips (one per month) are suggested.

The field trips should be closely related to the particular subject matter being dealt with at that stage of the program. Visits to a home for juvenile offenders, to a hospital's drug-treatment centre, and to a police station might be considered. The field trips should be realistic. For example, role-playing involving police arrest, booking, finger-printing might take place throughout the excursion to the police station. A briefing on the program is recommended for the hosts of the

field trips in order to facilitate communication with the students using the terminology of the program. For example, the juveniles from a group home may describe their experiences to the students in terms of negative fronting, being misled, etc.

Videotapes or movies portraying children who have had problems involving negative peer influence are shown periodically during the course (once every fourth rap session), so that the students can see situations they have talked about. Operation Aware has produced three videotapes, but it also suggests using movies obtainable within one's own school system. The videotapes produced by Operation Aware use the language of the program, such as fronting, friend versus buddy, etc. The teacher is provided with instructions for using the videotapes and bringing out their key points in discussion.

The fourth component of the Grade 6 program is the acting-out session. Negative situations in which the students might find themselves as they grow older are described. The students make decisions about how they would/should react in these situations. The implications of the different suggestions and ideas are discussed. Cards describing eleven such situations are available from Operation Aware. Teachers are also provided with suggestions on ways to discuss each situation.

Parent rap sessions

Parental involvement forms part of the Grade 6 program[6]. Monthly parent rap sessions are suggested. These sessions are held in a central location during the early evening by the same teacher who runs the students' program. The purposes of the parent rap sessions are: to keep the parents informed about the program's subject matter; to facilitate communication between parent and child; to help the parent support a troubled child using the terminology of the program; and to make parents aware of the negative influences that may be brought to bear on their children and thereby encourage the parents to try to guard against such influences.

---

6. We were unable to determine whether parental involvement is mandatory or optional.

Evaluation

Operation Aware has developed various instruments to determine what the students have learned from the program. The instruments include questions about the subject matter (such as naming various illegal drugs, etc.), and about concepts (such as why young people vandalize, use drugs, steal, etc.).

Another aspect of assessment is the students' evaluation of the Operation Aware program itself. Twelve questions are asked to determine their perception of the program. The completed questionnaires are sent to Operation Aware which tabulates the results and forwards them to the teacher.

Cost of Programs

The combined cost of the Grade 5 and 6 programs is approximately $500.00 per school[7]. The Grade 5 program is less expensive than the Grade 6 program ($150.00 compared with $350.00). The price includes one set of all the visual materials (except a set of Grade 5 drawings) and a teacher's manual. Postage is not included and prices are subject to change without notice.

Also available for purchase are coloured pamphlets about each subject area for the students' use. Posters for display in a junior high school may also be ordered. It is hoped that these posters will help the students remember the concepts taught in Grade 6.

All materials distributed by Operation Aware are under copyright and may not be reproduced, in any manner, without written permission from Operation Aware, Inc., or used for purposes other than for the program.

---

7. The research for this project was completed during May 1980. The most up-to-date price list at that time specified this price.

Training

Operation Aware training has been developed with the co-operation of the College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota. Two-day workshops have been held periodically throughout the year both in Duluth, and in Fargo, North Dakota. A presentation and teacher in-service session has also been held at Fort Frances, Ontario. There may also have been workshops in other locations in the United States of which we are not aware.

There are three separate phases to a complete training program. Phase I involves successful completion of a two-day workshop on the Grade 5 and 6 programs. The workshop includes: a presentation of the history of Operation Aware; an outline of the program's four basic instructional methods; an introduction to the concepts dealt with in the rap sessions; and field trips to various local institutions. Teachers, counsellors and anyone else interested in learning about Operation Aware are eligible to take Phase I. The registration fee for a workshop held in Duluth in June 1980 was $70.00.

In Phase II, teachers conduct Operation Aware classes for one term in their schools. Phase III is a two-day workshop which certifies instructors to train other teachers. Operation Aware will award Certified Teacher certification to an individual who has satisfactorily completed the first two phases.

Part of the Phase III training course involves review of recordings of teachers' Operation Aware classes and lesson plans. The workshop includes in-depth discussions of field experience and program planning, administrative information, and instruction in workshop objectives and content. The registration fee for a workshop held in Duluth in June 1980 was $70.00. For an additional $60.00, an individual who completes the three phases may obtain four graduate credits from a co-operating educational institution.

Instructors

Operation Aware has established guidelines to follow in selecting instructors for the program. These are:

1. Any certified full-time teacher or counsellor within the school faculty is eligible.

2. The individual must volunteer.

3. He or she must relate well to children.

4. He or she must feel comfortable running the program.

5. He or she must understand how much time the program will take up and be willing to donate that time to the program.

6. The individual must agree with the philosophy of the Operation Aware program and be able to present it in a positive manner.

7. The person must agree to follow the procedures established to implement the program as directed at the in-service workshop.

The instructor is required to sign an Operation Aware Agreement with the following actions specified:

1. Any major changes or additions to the program cannot be made without consultation with the director.

2. The program may not be used for personal or financial gain without consultation with the director.

3. Materials distributed by Operation Aware may not be reproduced, without written permission.

4. The materials must be used to initiate the program only in a designated city.

Operation Aware in Relation to Vandalism Prevention

Operation Aware attempts to teach students a positive approach to dealing with a variety of problems. It discusses the consequences of choosing various types of behaviour and tries to provide the students with the skills necessary to choose among them. The focus is on helping students to cope with negative peer pressure. In this regard, Operation Aware is relevant to a vandalism-prevention program.

The program is aimed at children who may be swayed to deviancy. These children are perceived as having relatively unstable values which fall somewhere between those of children with either clear socially positive or clear socially negative values. The aim of the program is to help children resist negative influences.

Vandalism is dealt with in relation to several topics - such as problems, fronting, being misled, and stealing. For example, during the sessions on problems, the students discuss such negative ways of solving problems as avoiding them, covering them up, or expressing one's frustration over a particular problem through such negative behaviour as stealing, breaking windows, defacing walls, etc. The students explore more positive approaches to solving problems - such as talking about them with parents, teachers, counsellors, etc.

The concept of fronting can be used to explain vandalism. Fronting is defined as a verbal or physical act designed to gain the attention of others which may be used to avoid facing one's inner feelings. A photograph of a boy throwing a rock through a window is used as an example of negative fronting.

The reasons why vandalism may occur are discussed in terms of the concepts developed in the various subjects. The program teaches the students that acts of vandalism are negative ways of dealing with problems and tries to suggest positive ways of dealing with the same sorts of problems.

The school boards in the three geographical areas acted independently of each other in introducing Operation Aware. However, the separate- and public-school boards in each of the two northern locations worked together throughout the project. Each area approached the program in a different manner. The following section outlines how Operation Aware was implemented in each area during 1979-80 and describes the status of the program for the 1980-81 school year.

Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education

Operation Aware was introduced to all Grade 5 and 6 students in ten elementary schools under the board's jurisdiction. Fort Frances-Rainy River is the only area in Ontario where the project is operating on a system-wide basis. The separate-school board is also involved with the program, but we did not have the opportunity to contact it.

The project was implemented in a very organized manner. The community and parents were made aware of the program at a public meeting at which the American director of Operation Aware made a presentation. The audience answered a short questionnaire designed to reveal their attitudes towards the program. The Board of Education held group sessions with the Grade 5 and 6 teachers, who also completed a questionnaire about their perception of the program. An Operation Aware board of directors composed of twelve members of the community was formed to administer the program.

An in-service training workshop, held in Fort Frances, was administered by the American director. Because of the geographical proximity of Fort Frances to Duluth, Minnesota, a close working relationship with the head office was possible. The training session was attended by all Grade 5 and 6 teachers from the district; some secondary-school teachers, and some correctional-service and police officers.

The board made a commitment to continue the project during the 1980-81 school year and to conduct an evaluation of it. The board appointed a teaching vice-principal as a consultant for a two-year term to oversee Operation Aware and to review the Family Life curriculum in elementary schools.

A procedure for evaluating Operation Aware has been designed by an O.I.S.E. (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) specialist in values education in consultation with the board. The evaluation was started last year and is continuing during the current school year.

The three components of the evaluation are: a moral-judgment questionnaire [8] for students, supplemented by personal interviews with selected students; a behaviour-rating scale; and a community survey. The morals judgment questionnaire is designed to measure students' level of moral reasoning before and after taking the Operation Aware program. The student writes his or her reaction to various moral situations. As a supplement, the same questionnaire is used as a basis for personal interviews with twenty students.

The second component of the evaluation, the behaviour-rating scale, investigates seven areas of behaviour involving peer pressure, such as: "The student is misled by his or her peers"; "The student uses 'put downs' in dealing with other students". The frequency with which a student exhibits each type of behaviour is indicated on the scale. The scale is given both before and after the program and answers are solicited from teachers, principals, and parents.

Three schools (public urban, separate urban, and rural) were selected to participate in the evaluation of Operation Aware. In addition, one class of students from a school with the Dryden Board of Education was selected to act as a control group - the students being requested to complete both the moral-judgment questionnaire and the behaviour-rating scale, but without having taken part in an Operation Aware Program.

The Grade 5 classes from the experimental schools who participated in the evaluation during the Spring of 1980 were to be reinterviewed after completing the Grade 6 section of Operation Aware during the fall of 1980. It is assumed that any measurable shift in moral reasoning or

---

8. Susan Pagliuso, Understanding Stages of Moral Development (Boston: Harvard Centre for Moral Development, 1976).

changes in a student's behaviour towards his or her peers may be attributed to Operation Aware. The Grade 5 students taking the program during 1980-81 were to be evaluated after taking the Grade 6 program during the following school year.

The third component of the evaluation is a community survey to determine the public's perception of juvenile crime. A door-to-door survey of 10 per cent of the households in the Fort Frances area was conducted by the Fort Frances police during the summer of 1980. This survey will be repeated after three or four years to determine any changes in public attitudes to juvenile crime. At that time, the students who are now receiving the Operation Aware program will be juveniles. It is assumed that any changes in juvenile crime perceived by the public may be related to Operation Aware.

Lakehead Boards of Education

The public- and separate-school boards in the Thunder Bay area co-operated in piloting the Operation Aware program in selected schools. Five public- and three separate-school teachers attended a teachers' training session in the United States. The Grade 6 component of Operation Aware was taught during the last semester of the 1979-80 school year at four public and three separate schools. Because of delays in receiving materials from Duluth, Minnesota, the schools were unable to begin the actual Grade 5 Operation Aware program.

At the time of writing, the Lakehead Board of Education intended to continue Operation Aware as a pilot during the 1980-81 school year. Both the Grade 5 and the Grade 6 sections are to be taught by trained teachers who will monitor how well the program relates both to the Ontario curriculum and to other programs - e.g. the board's Family Life program, and a local drug-education program called Options for Youth. The teachers will also assess how well Operation Aware meets the needs of the students and what modifications, if any, should be undertaken to ensure that these needs are met.

The Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board is continuing with the Operation Aware program at three schools in one Grade 5 class and two Grade 6 classes. (One of this board's teachers is a

certified Operation Aware teacher - Phase III). The board will examine the program to determine how well it complements the Ontario curriculum and the board's Christian Living and Social and Environmental Studies program.

Both boards planned to monitor the program throughout the school year. At the end of October 1980, a joint report on the status of Operation Aware was to be presented to its sponsors, the Rotary Club. During the previous school year, the boards jointly arranged and participated in the field trips which are a requirement of the Grade 6 program. This working relationship between the boards was to continue during the 1980-81 school year.

Lincoln County Board of Education

The Grade 6 Operation Aware program was taught to one class of thirty students at a suburban school. The board was to expand the program into a rural and an inner-city school for the 1980-81 school year. At the time of writing, it was uncertain whether both the Grade 5 and the Grade 6 Operation Aware programs would be taught at all three schools. The programs were to be taught by two teachers, one of whom had attended the teacher certification workshop in Duluth. An Operation Aware Committee, consisting of the two teachers and a school superintendent, was established to monitor and evaluate the program.

ASSESSMENT

A formal evaluation of Operation Aware has not, to the best of our knowledge, been completed. We have not received a response from the American director regarding any evaluation material. However, those teachers who attended training workshops reported that, according to the Operation Aware director, Duluth police statistics showed a substantial decrease in juvenile crime since the program was implemented, as well as a decrease in playground fighting and broken windows in schools.

In our opinion, conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Operation Aware as a program for Ontario schools would be premature at this time. Each school board is continuing with the program, on a pilot basis, and

has plans to monitor and/or evaluate it. The fact that each board has decided to continue or expand the program within its system represents at least a tentative endorsement of the program.

In monitoring the program, the boards' concern is with its value and relevance to their students and school system. One major concern is how well Operation Aware relates to such things as: board programs dealing with social, environmental, family, or religious issues; already existing values-education programs, or those still in the development stage; and provincial policy on curriculum for the primary and junior divisions of Ontario public schools.

An independent review (which was to be completed by December 1980) of Operation Aware to determine its value for Ontario schools was undertaken by the Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation. At the time the decision to undertake the review was made, the federation believed the program to be worthy of investigation. A representative of the federation met the American director and discussed the project with Fort Frances personnel. Further meetings with the administrator of the program, the Ontario police, and the Rotary Club were planned.

The following assessment describes both positive and negative aspects of Operation Aware. The information is based on the comments made by the Ontario educators who were interviewed by the research consultant. These included: teachers of the Grade 6 Operation Aware program; and specialists involved with curriculum and with values education. The teachers expressed their opinions of the training workshop, the content of the program, and its impact on their students. It should be noted that none of these students had previously received the Grade 5 Operation Aware program. In addition, two school boards made available the results from the student-evaluation questionnaire. A summary of the findings from the student questionnaire are presented.

Possible outcomes

The possible beneficial outcomes of Operation Aware were summarized by one Ontario teacher[9] as follows:

1. Pupils will have alternatives when faced by negative peer pressure.

2. Pupils will have a clearer system of values

3. Pupils will have a larger body of knowledge on non-academic subjects.

4. Pupils will have experience in solving many different kinds of problems through role-playing.

5. Pupils will have a better sense of their own worth and a clearer self-image.

6. Parents will have more topics to discuss at home with their children.

7. Parents will learn the coping skills being taught to their children.

8. Parents will have group discussions with the teacher and other parents.

9. The school will have opportunities to reinforce acceptable behaviour.

10. The school will be able to deal with individual and group problems in more creative and positive ways.

---

9. These statements represent this teacher's perception of Operation Aware before teaching the program at his school. It was assumed that parents would be involved in the program.

11. The community will reap the benefits of the above outcomes through quieter neighbourhoods.

12. The community will now be responding positively through this preventive program rather than having to treat the present negative outcomes of peer pressure and poor problem-solving by young people.

Students' evaluation

The students were required to complete a questionnaire designed to elicit their opinions about and attitudes to the Operation Aware program. The results from two Ontario school boards are presented in Table 3 and are very positive. The responses from the two school boards were similar.

The majority of students rated the program as excellent and believed it should be available to Grade 6 students the following year. Approximately three-fifths of the students from each school system rated the program as excellent in terms of preparing them for Grades 7 and 8 (junior high school) and one-half of the students claimed they were less worried about entering these grades after participating in this course.

Operation Aware aims at changing behaviour as well as attitudes. The students were asked if the program helped them to stop illegal activities, e.g., taking drugs or alcohol, stealing, or skipping school. Approximately one-third (30 per cent) of students from school board "A" and one-quarter (23 per cent) from school board "B" indicated that the program was effective in helping them to stop the illegal activity. The majority (82 per cent) of students from school board "A" indicated that the program changed the way they think and two-thirds (64 per cent), the way they behave.

The subjects which the students rated as most liked and most helpful include: juvenile procedure, dating, drugs, fronting, and being misled. Both groups of students believed that authority and class-skipping needed more clarification. The field trips were rated more positively than the videotapes by both groups of students.

Table 3: Student Evaluation of Operation Aware

Questions	School Board "A"	School Board B
Overall rating	%	%
Excellent	83	74
Good	7	26
Fair	10	-
Poor	-	-
Total	100	100
Rating re. preparing you for Grades 7 and 8		
Excellent	57	60
Good	23	33
Fair	17	7
Poor	3	-
Total	100	100
Feeling towards going to Grades 7 and 8 after taking programs		
Feel good	37	21
Less worried	50	51
Just as worried	-	2
Never been worried	13	26
Total	100	100
Program's effectiveness in helping you to quit illegal behaviour (drugs, alcohol, stealing, etc.)		
Quit	30	23
No	3	5
Never done anything illegal	67	72
Total	100	100

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

Questions	School Board "A"	School Board B
Three favorite Subjects		
First	Juvenile procedure	Dating
Second	Drugs	Fronting
Third	Fronting	Drugs
Three subject helped most		
First	Juvenile procedure	Fronting
Second	Being misled	Being misled
Third	Drugs	Drugs
Subjects needing more clarification		
First	Authority	Authority
Second	Dating	Class-skipping
Third	Class-skipping	Dating
Fourth	Problems	Drugs
Rating videotapes	%	%
Excellent	17	54
Good	46	40
Fair	20	3
Poor	17	3
Total	100	100
Opinion re. teaching program to Grade 6 students next year		
Yes	93	100
No	7	-
Total	100	100

Rating field trips (both school boards)	Trip 1 %	Trip 2 %	Trip 3 %
Excellent	74	70	76
Good	23	30	24
Fair	3	-	-
Poor	-	-	-
Total	100	100	100

Teachers' perceptions

1. Has a positive effect on students.

The teachers in each school system believed the students enjoyed the program. The topics were relevant to the age groups in question and thus held the students' attention. The students displayed great enthusiasm in participating in the rap sessions, field trips, etc.

The field trips were perceived as the most enjoyable and rewarding aspect of the program. After a visit to a youth drug-rehabilitation centre, one student wished to inform his drug-using friends of the negative effects of taking drugs. Similarly, at the end of the program, students informed their teachers that they had a better understanding of an alcoholic family member or of why siblings and/or friends were trying to influence them to take drugs, etc.

2. Gives students a common (shared) vocabulary to apply to abstract concepts.

3. Provides an opportunity for students to develop group-discussion skills. Stimulates peer interaction.

4. Enhances the relationship between students and teachers. Builds rapport and respect.

5. Is appropriate for all children. Is clearly and simply written.

6. Acts as a stimulus for boards to evaluate their values-education, family-life programs.

7. Appears to be supported by parents. (The parents were invited to a meeting on Operation Aware by each school board. Rap sessions were not held with parents.)

Negative Aspects

The school boards adopted the program on an experimental basis. The chief criticisms of and concerns about Operation Aware involved: the administration of the program; the content of the program; and the feasibility of implementing the program on a system-wide basis.

Administration

1. It was reported that the Operation Aware director employed a high-pressure, hard-sell approach in training workshops. The focus of the workshops was seen to be convincing teachers to implement the program rather than training them to be instructors.

2. The administration of Operation Aware was perceived as maintaining excessive control over the program. All material is copyright, teachers must sign a contract not to deviate from the program. The administration is viewed as rigid and unflexible.

3. School boards have reported excessive delays in receiving necessary program materials.

4. Material to assist in evaluating the program (if it exists) has not been made available.

5. Some aspects of the requirements for Phase III (Certified Teacher Training) are excessive. Experienced classroom teachers did not feel it was necessary to have the director approve their lesson plans, tape recordings, etc.

Operation Aware program

1. The philosophy of the program is unclear. Some educators viewed it as authoritarian and based on indoctrination (although others viewed the program as based on values-clarification, information-giving, and problem-solving).

One educator believed that the presentation of certain concepts of the program may contradict the presentation of similar concepts in the provincial curriculum. For example, in his view, the provincial curriculum presents obedience to authority in terms of rational principles (that is, we obey because we have reason to) whereas Operation Aware presents obedience to authority in terms of punishment (we obey because we will be punished if we don't).

2. The program originated and is administered in the United States. The American content of the programs needs to be modified. The section on juvenile procedure is not applicable to the Canadian judicial system. Apparently one school board had a revised section drafted by Canadian specialists.

The American director has modified some, but not all, of the visual material for use by Canadians. For example, a photograph shows a youth holding a beer bottle with a brand label of a Canadian company. It has been suggested to the director that the videotapes be redone with Canadian students to eliminate the American accents.

3. Some teachers may not be suitable presenters of the program. The concern was expressed that an insensitive teacher might present the program in a detrimental way by "preaching" or by employing scare tactics.

4. Some of the suggested teaching techniques appear naive to Canadian teachers. It was suggested that teachers should have the freedom to modify the program to suit their own teaching styles and the needs of their students.

Feasibility of implementing the program

Only one school board has implemented the program on a system-wide basis. At the present time, Rotary clubs are sponsoring the pilot projects. The costs of the program involve teacher training and purchasing the materials for each school. The costs of the teacher training are substantially reduced if a teacher within a school board becomes certified (Phase III) to train fellow teachers.

The field trips, suggested for the Grade 6 program, are expensive. The question of who should finance these trips needs to be decided. The field trips also require available, co-operating agencies with the capacity, the expertise, and the time to host school visits. A prerequisite of the field trips is that the personnel of the agencies be briefed on Operation Aware so that they may communicate the concepts involved in coping with negative peer pressure in terms the students can understand. One method of reducing the cost of field trips may be to invite guest speakers to a classroom, although this is contrary to the requirements of the program.

Recommendations

At present, any statement about the effectiveness of Operation Aware would be premature. Clearly, the Ministry of Education should follow the evaluation of the program being undertaken by the Ontario school boards. A formal evaluation was undertaken by the Fort Frances-Rainy River Board. The public- and separate-school Lakehead Boards and the Lincoln County Board also planned to monitor and assess the programs during the 1980-81 school year.

DIVERSION

INTRODUCTION

The Waterloo County Board of Education is co-operating in a Diversion program for first-time juvenile offenders. The program, introduced to Kitchener-Waterloo in 1977, is operated by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Its purpose is, simply, to enable young offenders to be dealt with in ways which may postpone or prevent entirely their entry into the formal criminal-justice system. The purpose of our study was to investigate the involvement of the board with the Diversion program, not to describe or evaluate Diversion programs *per se*.

This section of the report presents a brief description of Diversion both in Canada and in the Waterloo region, and outlines, in particular, the Waterloo County Board of Education's experience with this program. It should be noted that although Diversion is not a vandalism-prevention program, it may involve offenders who have committed acts of vandalism or theft.

DIVERSION IN CANADA

The Diversion program is "a process whereby penetration into and formalized processing within the criminal-justice system is minimized or avoided entirely".[10] From the time the concept was introduced in Canada in 1974, several Diversion projects have been implemented. The Solicitor General Canada and the Department of Justice are jointly responsible for the experimental programs.

Potentially, Diversion can help reduce the number of cases coming into court, compensate victims, and establish, for the community, a way of supporting people in conflict with the law. It encourages the offender to accept responsibility for criminal behaviour. Therefore, both the offender and the community are involved in the Diversion process.

---

10. Solicitor General Canada, *Diversion* (Ottawa: n.d.). The problem of defining Diversion operationally is referred to in: Solicitor General Canada, *National Inventory of Diversion Projects - An Update* (Ottawa: 1979). It was reported that there was as yet no national consensus on the definition.

Diversion can occur at any of the following four levels of intervention: community; police; crown-prosecutor; and court. In community-based Diversion programs, intervention takes place after the offence but before police contact leading to formal charges occurs. Police-based Diversion involves a formal referral by the police of an offender to a Diversion program as an alternative to proceeding with the normal course of criminal justice. In this case, the offender is diverted at point of contact with the police.

It is also possible to divert the offender from the criminal-justice system once a charge has been laid and the case is before the office of a crown attorney. Instead of proceeding with charges in the criminal court, the crown may refer a case to a Diversion program. Court-based Diversion is also possible. During remands before trial, the judge may refer the parties involved to a Diversion program for resolution of conflict.

Diversion programs operating in Canada may involve one or more of the types of referral listed above. Various guidelines have been suggested regarding eligibility, types of program, record-keeping, and action to be taken in the event of non-completion (or completion) of the program.

WATERLOO REGION DIVERSION PROGRAM

A Diversion program was started in February 1977 in the Waterloo region. The program is operated by Probation and Aftercare, Ministry of Community and Social Services, since it involves young persons under sixteen years of age. The stated objectives of the project are:[11]

1. To reduce the number of young people appearing in juvenile court by providing pre-trial diversion.

2. To offer a formalized process as an alternative to further penetration of the criminal-justice system and the resultant "record".

---

11. Solicitor General Canada, National Inventory of Diversion Projects - An Update (Ottawa: 1979).

3. To provide informal dealing, focusing on the act for which the charge is laid.

4. To maximize problem solving and conciliation between the offender and the victim and/or community in a way that is just and equitable for all.

5. To promote a sense of responsibility in the community and in the offender for dealing with the problem of delinquency through direct involvement.

6. To offer "treatment" for personal, family, or other problems on a voluntary basis.

7. To reduce the recidivism rate among young people.

A juvenile may be eligible for the program provided certain conditions are met: e.g., the offence did not result in serious physical harm or death; the charge is not truancy; it is the first charge laid against the offender; and the offender has not been found delinquent within the last two years and has not unsuccessfully participated in a Diversion program during that period of time. The young offender, in consultation with his or her parents, decides whether to participate in Diversion or to proceed with the traditional justice system.

A juvenile who chooses to enter the Diversion program must follow certain procedures before entering into an agreement. The young person discusses the offence and the Diversion program with probation and aftercare officers, a lawyer, and his or her parents. Responsibility for the alleged offence is admitted by the young person, who must voluntarily accept the conditions of the agreement.

The agreement outlines the actions to be followed. The conditions may include: no further breach of law; apology; community service, restitution - either in money or in work; counselling; drug-alcohol education; observance of curfew; etc. The young person is supervised for the duration of the three-month agreement. Failure to comply with the terms of the agreement results in the return of the case to the

referring agent for processing through the court. Upon successful completion of the agreement, a recommendation is made for withdrawal of the charge.

WATERLOO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Involvement in Diversion

The Waterloo County Board of Education became involved in the Diversion program in March 1979. The board provides the opportunity for young persons to satisfy the conditions of their Diversion agreement. The young person may or may not be a student within the school system. The alleged offence is not necessarily one committed against a school or school staff. The board arranges for the conditions of the agreement to be completed by the young person.

The board has been involved in eight Diversion cases.[12] Most of the offences were breaking-and-entering and/or theft. Two cases involved wilful damage. The conditions of these cases have mainly involved apology and payment for damage in money and work. A board employee is responsible for arranging for restitution through work at a school. The schools participate on a voluntary basis. If an offence was against a school or school staff, an attempt is made to arrange restitution through work at the particular school where the offence occurred.

The board maintains a list of janitorial activities that need to be completed at various schools. The activity usually requires minimal supervision, is not the responsibility of a school custodian, and may help to develop pride in the young person. (For example, one youth conducted an energy-conservation experiment by replacing light bulbs in the school.) The offender is under the supervision of the school custodian who is asked to evaluate the youth's performance.

---

12. The board co-operated in another two cases involving persons over sixteen years of age. These cases were part of a VORP (Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program). This program attempts to effect reconciliation between the victim and the offender in order to facilitate restitution. It is viewed as an alternative to the criminal-justice system.

Assessment

An interview was conducted with a board employee to determine his perception of the board's involvement with the Diversion program. The board supports the project in principle and is willing to provide the opportunity to help a young person in conflict with the law. The board's involvement in the actual program is minimal since its main role is to organize restitution through work at the schools.

The board's experience with the program has been positive. However, the board has not formally evaluated its involvement, mainly because the number of cases has been small. Schools have benefited from the provision for making restitution and the custodians have provided positive performance evaluations of the youths. The board tries to foster a positive relationship with the young person and hopes that he or she may act as a model to other students.

Very few problems have occurred. Initially, the program was not fully explained to the custodians who were concerned about work-related issues. The schools participate on a voluntary basis since some of the principals are opposed to the program. It is a policy of the Diversion program that a probation officer escorts the young offender to the head custodian of the designated school for the initial visit. At the beginning of the program, this procedure was not always adhered to and this sometimes caused transportation difficulties for the young person. The board now attempts to place a young person in a school near his or her place of residence to alleviate these transportation problems, although in some cases, these arrangements are difficult to make.

The Waterloo region Diversion program is being evaluated by a local probation officer, Mr. E. D. Dubas. From February 1977 to August 1979, 253 youths participated in the program. The majority of offences involved breaking-and-entering and theft. Wilful damage accounted for 3 per cent of the charges. During this period, the Waterloo County Board of Education was involved in six service orders for work restitutions totalling sixty-one hours. Four offenders completed thirty-one hours of work as agreed to. Only part of the work agreed to by the other two offenders was completed. According to the probation

officer, the number of hours of work completed by youths in the Diversion program for the Board of Education has improved since August 1979.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are Diversion programs operating in several Ontario areas (among them are Windsor, Toronto, Kingston, and Sudbury). In our opinion, the Ministry of Education should continue to investigate the experience of the Waterloo County Board of Education with Diversion cases. It is recommended that school boards should be informed of the opportunity to participate in a Diversion project in those areas where the program is operating.

The program is limited in terms of vandalism prevention because it involves only those young people who have been apprehended by the law. Since one goal is to reduce the recidivism rate among young offenders, vandalism and crime may be reduced.

SUMMARY

Introduction

This research project was designed to identify, describe, and assess a variety of student-oriented vandalism-prevention programs. The focus was on programs that modify the behaviour of students. An investigation of such physical-plant-related measures as installing alarms, hardening of the building, etc., was not a component of the study. The project was viewed as a necessary step before developing a comprehensive vandalism-prevention program.

The information in this report is based on an investigation of three programs: Project PRIDE (Pupils Responsible In Determining Their Own Environment); Operation Aware; and a Diversion program. Detailed summaries of the general research methods used and of the nature and the positive and negative effects of each program follow.

Research Methods

Behaviour-oriented programs were identified from the responses and comments in the principals' questionnaires used for the 1979 school survey.[1] The Ministry of Education contacted the boards and/or schools to seek permission to assess their programs. Two programs were selected for detailed investigation: Project PRIDE (Lakehead Board of Education); and Operation Aware (Lincoln County Board of Education, Lakehead Board of Education, Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board, Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education). It was also decided to explore the involvement of the Waterloo County Board of Education with the Diversion program operated by the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

A case-study approach was used to describe and assess the programs. Much of the information was collected through informal interviews with the participants. Because the nature of the study required a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach, the conclusions drawn here should be treated with caution. It should be noted that these three programs were thought of as pilot programs by the boards involved.

PROJECT PRIDE

Introduction

The Lakehead Board of Education initiated Project PRIDE (Pupils Responsible In Determining their own Environment) in its school system in September 1979. The program developed by the board is totally independent of the Project Pride (A Positive Approach to Vandalism) which originated in San Bruno, California, in 1976. Project PRIDE can be described as a behaviour-oriented vandalism-prevention measure.

---

1. James White and Anita Fallis, Vandalism-Prevention Programs Used in Ontario Schools (Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1980).

Description of Project

The stated goals of Project PRIDE are:[2]

1. To develop a sense of pride within the students themselves.
2. To increase the awareness in students that vandalism costs money.
3. To have students take more responsibility for the care and cleanliness of their school and school grounds.
4. To provide a potential financial resource for the students' council.
5. To ensure that repairs required as a result of vandalism are completed immediately.
6. To prevent the spread of damage to property as a result of vandalism.
7. To ensure our school grounds are free of litter and garbage.

The major component of Project PRIDE is a financial-incentive program. A fund or "PRIDE Account" is established for every elementary and secondary school. The costs of acts of vandalism are subtracted from the fund and the balance is given to the students' council (or similar representative group) at the end of the school year. The student group, in consultation with the principal, determines the disposition of the monies or PRIDE Dollars.

Each school was supplied with Project PRIDE materials, including pamphlets for student distribution and a PRIDE Account barometer. Apart from these materials and guidelines, the actual implementation of the program was at the discretion of the school principals.

Assessment

A comprehensive evaluation of Project PRIDE was undertaken by a committee consisting of three school principals and the board's research director. InfoResults Limited assisted the committee in designing a questionnaire, participated in the collection of data, and conducted informal interviews with board personnel and principals. The data collected was of two major types: financial statistics; and the results of an opinion survey of board personnel, school staff, and students.

Financial analysis

A summary of each school's PRIDE Account balance was prepared by the board. Just over half (52.6 per cent) of the 1978-79 vandalism budget of $34,876 was returned to the schools on June 1, 1980. The 1979-80 vandalism costs[3] totalled $18,326, leaving a balance of $18,474 payable to the schools. Two-thirds (65.4 per cent) of the original amount

---

2. Memo to The Chairman and Members of The Resources Management Committee from The Lakehead Board of Education (May 18, 1979).

3. $1,924 was subtracted from the 1979-80 vandalism costs. This represents the amount of money spent on vandalism repair which exceeded the PRIDE Accounts of four schools.

allocated to the elementary schools was returned compared to two-fifths (41.4 per cent) of the secondary-school budget. The vandalism costs at four schools exceeded their PRIDE Accounts.

The prevention of vandalism involves a combination of factors. It would be an oversimplification to attribute all the reduction of the 1978-79 vandalism budget to Project PRIDE. Physical-plant procedures may reduce vandalism rates, as may variations in what is reported as vandalism and thus charged to PRIDE as a vandalism cost. This was the first year a definite vandalism-reporting system functioned between the schools and the board.

Perceptions of participants

The board's evaluation committee conducted a survey of 258 board personnel, school staff, and students to determine their perceptions of Project PRIDE. Group discussions were conducted with principals, with twenty elementary students from different schools, and with maintenance-department personnel. Selected board employees and three principals were personally interviewed by InfoResults Limited.

The topics investigated in the questionnaire included: the extent to which the goals of the project are being achieved; the administration of the program; positive and negative results, use of the money in the incentive fund; and the amount of school vandalism. A basic questionnaire was designed, with modifications for the various types of respondents.

Out of the 258 questionnaires distributed, 177 were returned, giving a response rate of 68.6 per cent. The number of completed questionnaires by type of respondent was: principals, thirty-seven; vice-principals, thirty; teachers, including department heads, fifty-five; custodians, thirty-seven; and students, eighteen.

Achievement of Goals

The respondents were asked to indicate what progress they believed had been made towards reaching each of the seven goals of Project PRIDE. The responses from the interviewees with regard to each goal were summarized to create an over-all goal-achievement index. These calculations were undertaken by the Project PRIDE Evaluation Committee.

Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of the respondents perceived some progress towards the goals of Project PRIDE; 13 per cent did not perceive progress; 8 per cent did not know; and 7 per cent did not give an answer. In terms of the specific response categories, 15 per cent perceived a great deal of progress, one-third (32 per cent) perceived moderate progress, and one-quarter (25 per cent) slight progress.

It was felt that more progress had been made in teaching students that vandalism costs money than towards any of the other goals. Eighty-four per cent of the respondents felt that slight, moderate, or great progress had been made towards realizing this goal. Approximately three-quarters perceived some progress towards three goals - to develop pride in students; to ensure damage was repaired immediately; and to have students take responsibility for the care of the school. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents perceived progress towards

each of the remaining three goals - to provide funds for the students' council; to prevent the spread of vandalism; and to keep the school clean.

First-Year Problems and Difficulties

Any program during its first year of operation is likely to experience difficulties, many of which cannot be anticipated or which develop as a result of the program. The identification of such problems is important if modifications are to be made in subsequent years. Several problems of implementation and administration were identified, and these are summarised below.

Implementation

The principals were told about the project and given guidelines for its implementation. The manner in which the program was introduced at each school was at the discretion of the principal. The implementation of the project caused some difficulties and/or concerns at a minority of schools with the result that the project was not fully introduced at a few schools.

Administration and operation

The administration of the program varied among the schools. At some schools, a Project PRIDE committee was responsible for evaluating the condition of the school premises. The charges against the school's PRIDE Account were forwarded to the school by the board's business department.

At several schools, it was felt that the communication between the board's business office and the school with regard to charges made against the PRIDE Account was the only functioning component of the program. The actual involvement of the schools with the program, apart from making known the existence of the incentive fund, is difficult to estimate. It would appear that the project was not greatly emphasized or promoted.

Several problems concerning the administration and operation of the program were outlined by the survey respondents. One of the major difficulties was the lack of a clear definition of school vandalism. Without a explanation of what constituted vandalism, some schools found it difficult to distinguish vandalism from accidental damage.

No individual was designated as the final authority on whether or not to charge a school's PRIDE Account. The principals, the board, and the maintenance personnel were all involved in the process. The program's stated goal that damage from vandalism should be repaired within forty-eight hours was also cited as causing problems. Maintenance personnel questioned whether all types of vandalism should be given equal priority, since the emphasis on this type of repair tends to impede other work.

The quidelines for charging external vandalism were also questioned. External school vandalism up to $300 was charged to a school's PRIDE Account. Often external vandalism is quite extensive, involving broken windows, which are expensive to replace. Some administrators expressed

concern that the students might become discouraged, frustrated, and demoralized at losing their PRIDE Dollars when they were not responsible for the vandalism.

Positive results of Project PRIDE

Project PRIDE was perceived by the survey respondents as producing several benefits for the students and the school. The perceived benefits closely resembled most of the goals of the program. One purpose of the incentive fund was to allow students to see the positive results of refraining from vandalism. Several recreational and educational activities were made possible by the incentive fund, including field trips, the purchase of playground equipment, the establishment of a scholarship fund, etc.

The program also created an awareness of and interest in vandalism and the costs of repairs among students, school staff, and parents. Other perceived benefits were: cleaner schools; prompt maintenance service; increased responsibility for making restitution among students; and a reduction of vandalism in several schools.

Negative results of Project PRIDE

Almost all the survey participants (with the exception of the students) were asked to indicate any negative results, either actual or potential, of Project PRIDE. The most frequent objection was to the deduction of PRIDE Dollars for vandalism committed by non-students outside school hours. A number of respondents commented on the increase or potential increase in vandalism as a direct result of the project, suggesting that students wishing revenge on the school, students responding negatively to the publicity given to the project, and school rivalry might account for it. However, no research data were obtained to support these opinions.

OPERATION AWARE

Introduction

Operation Aware is an awareness program designed to teach Grade 5 and 6 students what to expect from their peers as they mature and how to cope with negative peer influence. The approach is positive and involves various types of instruction. The program was started in 1976 in Duluth, Minnesota, at two Catholic schools and has expanded into the public- and catholic school-systems in Duluth and into many schools throughout the United States. Operation Aware is an incorporated company (1978) and is described as a non-profit organization. It provides training workshops and materials necessary to conduct the program.

During the 1979-80 school year, five Ontario school boards adopted Operation Aware as a pilot program. InfoResults Limited investigated the Operation Aware programs being piloted in Ontario. Operation Aware, although not directly involved in vandalism prevention, was viewed as a possible preventive, behaviour-oriented approach to the problem of school vandalism.

This section of the report describes and assesses the Operation Aware program, as we understand it. At the time of writing, our letters to the American director of the program remained unanswered, so that the information regarding this program was obtained mainly through interviews with teachers and co-ordinators of the program, review of the available materials, and direct observation of an Operation Aware class.

Description of Operation Aware

The programs

Operation Aware consists of two programs: one for Grade 5 students and a follow-up program for the same students when they are in Grade 6. Central to both programs are rap sessions during which the students discuss subjects in which negative peer pressure is the main theme. During these rap sessions, the students learn to identify, discuss, and question peer influence as well as to interact with each other. They also learn a rhetoric and terminology unique to the program.

The Grade 5 program provides the students with a basic understanding of eight key subjects. The subjects include: fronting; being misled; problems; class-skipping; stealing; authority; friends/buddy; and put-downs. Weekly half-hour-long meetings are held over a period of three months.

The basic tool of the Grade 5 program is the rap session. A film strip with a cassette is shown after each rap session to illustrate what has been discussed. Verbal review and memory quizzes are used to reinforce what has been taught.

The Grade 6 program is an in-depth, four month-course. The program utilizes four basic types of instruction: rap sessions; field trips; audio-visual sessions (movies/videotapes); and acting out sessions. During the rap sessions, the subjects from the Grade 5 program as well as drugs, dating, juvenile procedure, and setting standards are discussed. During these sessions, the students are encouraged to talk, give examples from their own experience, and ask questions.

Field trips to institutions dealing with juvenile crime are an integral aspect of the Grade 6 program. The purpose of the trips is to make the students aware of what they can expect if they choose to make wrong decisions. Videotapes or movies portraying children who have had problems involving negative peer influence are shown periodically during the course. Operation Aware has produced three videotapes, but it also suggests using movies obtainable within one's own school system.

The fourth component of the Grade 6 program is called the acting out session. Negative situations in which the students might find themselves as they grow older are described and the students make decisions about how they would/should react in these situations. Material illustrating eleven such situations is available from Operation Aware.

Operation Aware has developed various instruments to determine what the students have learned from the program. Another part of the assessment is how the students themselves evaluate the program in a twelve-item questionnaire.

Cost of programs

The combined cost of the Grade 5 and 6 programs is approximately $500.00 per school.[4] All materials distributed by Operation Aware are under copyright and may not be reproduced, in any manner, without written permission from Operation Aware, Inc. or used for purposes other than for the program.

Operation Aware Workshop

Operation Aware training has been developed with the co-operation of the College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota. There are three separate phases to a complete training program. Phase I involves successful completion of a two-day workshop on the Grades 5 and 6 programs. In Phase II, teachers conduct Operation Aware classes for one term in their schools. Phase III is a two-day workshop which certifies instructors to train other teachers.

Operation Aware has established guidelines to follow in selecting instructors for the program and instructors are required to sign an agreement with Operation Aware.

Operation Aware in Relation to Vandalism Prevention

Operation Aware attempts to teach students a positive approach in dealing with a variety of problems. It discusses the consequences of choosing various types of behaviour and tries to provide the students with the skills necessary to choose among them. In this regard, Operation Aware is relevant to a vandalism-prevention program.

Vandalism is dealt with in relation to several topics - such as problems, fronting, being misled, and stealing. For example, during the sessions on problems, the students discuss such negative ways of solving problems as avoiding them, covering them up, or expressing one's frustrations through stealing, breaking windows, defacing walls, etc. The students explore more positive approaches to solving problems - such as talking about them with parents, teachers, counsellors, etc.

Operation Aware in Ontario

The following section outlines how Operation Aware was implemented during 1979-80 and describes the status of the program for the 1980-81 school year.

Fort Frances-Rainy River Board of Education

Operation Aware was introduced to all Grade 5 and 6 students in ten elementary schools under the board's jurisdiction. Fort Frances-Rainy River is the only area in Ontario where the project is operating on a system-wide basis. The separate-school board is also involved with the program, but we did not have the opportunity to contact it.

---

4. The research for this project was completed during May 1980. The most up-to-date price list at that time specified this price.

The project was implemented in a very organized manner. The community and parents were made aware of the program at a public meeting. The Board of Education held group sessions with teachers who completed a questionnaire about their perception of the program. An Operation Aware board of directors composed of members of the community was formed to administer the program. An in-service training workshop, held in Fort Frances, was administered by the American director.

The board made a commitment to continue the project during the 1980-81 school year and to conduct an evaluation of it. The evaluation has three parts: a moral-judgement questionnaire for students, supplemented by personal interviews with selected students; a behaviour-rating scale; and a community survey. Each of these components was to be administered both before and after the program was undertaken.

Three schools (public and separate urban, and rural) were selected to participate in the evaluation of Operation Aware. In addition, one class of students from a school with another school board was selected to act as a control group. It is assumed that any measurable shift in moral reasoning or changes in a student's behaviour towards his or her peers may be attributed to Operation Aware.

Lakehead Boards of Education

The public- and separate-school boards in the Thunder Bay area co-operated in piloting the Operation Aware program in selected schools. The Grade 6 component of the program was taught during the last semester of the 1979-80 school year at four public and three separate schools.

At the time of writing, the Lakehead Board of Education intended to continue the program as a pilot during the 1980-81 school year. Both the Grade 5 and the Grade 6 programs are to be presented by trained teachers who will monitor how well the program relates both to the Ontario curriculum and to other programs and decide what modifications, if any, are necessary to suit the particular needs of their students.

The Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board is continuing with the program at three schools in one Grade 5 class and two Grade 6 classes during the 1980-81 school year. Again the program will be monitored.

Lincoln County Board of Education

The Grade 6 program was taught to one class of students at a suburban school. The board intended to expand the program into a rural and an inner-city school for the 1980-81 school year. An Operation Aware Committee was established to monitor and evaluate the program.

Assessment

A formal evaluation of Operation Aware has not, to the best of our knowledge, been completed. We have not, at this time, received correspondence from the Operation Aware director regarding any evaluation material. However, those teachers who attended training workshops informed us that the American director reported that Duluth police statistics showed a substantial decrease in juvenile crime since the program was implemented.

The following assessment describes both positive and negative aspects of Operation Aware. The information is based on the comments made by the Ontario educators who were interviewed by the research consultant. (It should be noted that none of the students in the program had previously received the Grade 5 Operation Aware program.) In addition, two school boards made available the results from the student-evaluation questionnaire.

Positive Aspects

Students' evaluation

The students were required to complete a questionnaire designed to elicit their opinions about and attitudes to the Operation Aware program. The results from two Ontario school boards are very positive in similar ways. The majority of students rated the program as excellent and believed it should be available to Grade 6 students the following year.

Teachers' perceptions

The teachers in each school system believed the students enjoyed the program. The topics were relevant and thus held the students' attention. The students displayed great enthusiasm for the rap sessions and field trips. The program teaches students a common (shared) vocabulary to apply to abstract concepts; it also provides an opportunity for students to develop group-discussion skills. The teachers believed that the program enhances the relationship between students and teachers by building rapport and respect. The program was perceived as appropriate for all Ontario children and appears to have stimulated boards to evaluate their values-education and family-life programs.

Negative Aspects

The school boards adopted the program on an experimental basis. The chief criticisms of and concerns about Operation Aware involved: the administration of the program; the content of the program; and the feasibility of implementing the program on a system-wide basis.

DIVERSION

Introduction

The Waterloo County Board of Education is co-operating in a Diversion program for first-time juvenile offenders. The program's purpose is to evaluate young offenders to be dealt with in ways which may postpone or prevent entirely their entry into the formal criminal-justice system. The purpose of our study was to investigate the involvement of the board with the Diversion program, not to describe or evaluate Diversion programs *per se*.

Diversion in Canada

The Diversion program is a "process whereby penetration into and formalized processing within the criminal-justice system is minimized or avoided entirely".[5] From the time the concept was introduced in Canada in 1974, several Diversion projects have been implemented.

Diversion can help reduce the number of cases coming into court, compensate victims and establish for the community a way of supporting people in conflict with the law. It encourages the offender to accept responsibility for criminal behaviour. Therefore, both the offender and the community are involved in the Diversion process.

Diversion can occur at any of four levels of intervention: community; police; crown-prosecutor; and court. Diversion programs operating in Canada may involve one or more of the types of referral listed above. Various guidelines have been suggested regarding eligibility, types of program, record-keeping, and action to be taken in the event of non-completion (or completion) of the program.

Waterloo Region Diversion Program

A Diversion program was started in the Waterloo region during 1977 by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. A juvenile may be eligible for the program provided certain conditions are met. The young offender, in consultation with his or her parents, decides whether to participate in Diversion or to proceed with the traditional justice system.

A juvenile who chooses to enter the Diversion program must then enter into an agreement. The agreement outlines the actions to be followed. The conditions may include: no further breach of law; apology; community service; restitution - either in money or work, etc. Failure to comply with the terms of the agreement results in the return of the case to the referring agent for processing through the court. Upon successful completion of the agreement, a recommendation is made for withdrawal of the charge.

Waterloo County Board of Education

Involvement in Diversion

The Waterloo Country Board of Education became involved in the Diversion program in March 1979. The board provides the opportunity for young persons to satisfy the conditions of their Diversion agreement. The young person may or may not be a student within the school system. The alleged offence is not necessarily one committed against a school or school staff.

The board has been involved in eight Diversion cases. Most of the offenses were breaking-and-entering and/or theft. The conditions of these cases have mainly involved apology, and repayment in money or work. Schools participate on a voluntary basis. The board maintains a list of janitorial activities that need to be completed at various schools and arranges for work restitution.

---

5. Solicitor General Canada, Diversion (Ottawa: n.d.).

Assessment

An interview was conducted with a board employee to determine his perception of the board's involvement with the Diversion program. The board's involvement in the program is minimal since its main role is to organize the work restitution. The board's experience with the program has been positive. However, it has not formally evaluated its involvement, mainly because the number of cases is very small. Very few problems have occurred.

Project PRIDE

The Project PRIDE program appears to have been successful during its first year. The majority of the school staff and students who participated in an evaluation of the project felt that most of its goals were being achieved to some degree. The cost of vandalism was substantially reduced between 1979 and 1980. The PRIDE Dollars were used by the students to support several school activities and projects.

The proportion of the reduction in the cost of vandalism which can be directly attributed to the project cannot be determined. At many schools the program was not actually implemented or appears to have had very little impact. Some problems arose in connection with the administration and operation of the project. In light of the findings from the evaluation, it was the board's intention to review the program in order to determine what modifications are necessary for the smoother running of the program during the 1980-81 school year.

The program made many students and staff aware, for the first time, of the actual dollar cost of vandalism. This program is especially significant in that it is one of the few attempts to reduce school vandalism by means of a behaviour-oriented program rather than a physical-plant-oriented program.

Operation Aware

At present, it is too early to draw any firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Operation Aware. We suggest that the Ministry of Education should follow the evaluation of the program undertaken by the Ontario school boards - both the formal evaluation carried out by the Fort Frances-Rainy River Board and the informal monitoring and assessment by the public and separate-school Lakehead Boards and the Lincoln County Board during the 1980-81 school year.

Diversion

There are Diversion programs operating in several Ontario areas. In our opinion, the Ministry of Education should continue to investigate the experience of the Waterloo County Board of Education with its Diversion cases. It is recommended that school boards be informed of the opportunity to participate in a Diversion project in those areas where the program is operating. The program is limited in terms of vandalism prevention because it involves only those young people who have been apprehended by the law. Since one goal is to reduce the recidivism rate among young offenders, vandalism and crime may be reduced.

APPENDIX: Project PRIDE Materials

THE WEEKLY EVALUATION

The whole idea of the project is to eliminate vandalism. Therefore, each school will be inspected and evaluated weekly, during the school year, and in this manner:

The Principal and student representatives will evaluate the condition of the school building and grounds. Each school may develop its own check-off form, or use the one provided by the Board.

This report will be kept in the school by the Principal.

Following each evaluation, the Principal and Students' Council will initiate any action required to clean up the school grounds and/or repair damaged property.

INITIATING REPAIRS AND CLEAN UP

As a result of the weekly evaluation, an act of vandalism, or the need to clean up the school grounds, the Principal will initiate a request for repairs. This can be done through the custodian.

If it isn't possible for the custodian or the maintenance department to do the necessary repairs with 48 hours*, the Principal will hire someone else to complete them. If this action is required, the Principal must follow the normal board procedures for making special purchases.

Meanwhile, if students can be encouraged to pick up their own litter and garbage, there will be no need to hire anyone. Similarly, if restitution is made to the Board on any act of vandalism, there will be no charge to the school PRIDE account. However, if this doesn't happen soon enough, the Principal will hire someone to complete the necessary tasks.

CONCLUSION

Project PRIDE is a sincere attempt to instill in our young people a sense of pride in themselves, their school buildings, and school grounds. Hopefully, they will accept the challenge that has been given them, and be rewarded by PRIDE dollars for school events, special projects, field trips, athletics, or any other worthwhile endeavours.

This project directly supports the Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce Civic Beautification Campaign, and the recently appointed committee on vandalism in the City of Thunder Bay.

School administrators will closely monitor the success of the project during the coming school year, and report to the Board at year's end.

*The reason for insisting upon such rapid repairs is because the sooner graffiti, etc., is removed from walls or doors, the less likely it is that more will be added.

PUBLISHED BY
THE LAKEHEAD BOARD OF EDUCATION
2135 SILLS STREET, THUNDER BAY, ONTARIO P7E 5T2
TELEPHONE: 622-3941

PROJECT PRIDE

"PUPILS RESPONSIBLE IN DETERMINING THEIR OWN ENVIRONMENT"

THE LAKEHEAD BOARD OF EDUCATION

PUPILS RESPONSIBLE IN DETERMINING THEIR OWN ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION:

Every Year, The Lakehead Board of Education spends a considerable number of tax dollars on the repair or replacement of vandalized school property. During the 1978/79 school year, for instance, that amounted to approximately $35,000, but the figure has been increasing for the past few years.

Such an expenditure is obviously wasted money, because it has to be spent on repairing perfectly good structures and materials that have been maliciously damaged.

In some cases, the vandalism is committed by the very students who attend the target schools. Their numbers represent only a small percentage of the entire student enrolment, yet their destructive activities affect everyone in the system, since money that could benefit all, must be diverted to the unproductive deeds of a few.

Moreover, to discourage vandalism and other related crimes, The Board has had to install and operate special alarm systems, extra lighting, and in some cases, even dog patrols. That all represents money that could be put to much better use within our classrooms.

So far, the solutions attempted by this and other boards, haven't accomplished very much in the way of curbing vandalism. What seems to be needed therefore, is a program that will provide the rising generation with the necessary incentive to keep their own school buildings and grounds in better condition. In other words, instead of hiring more policemen or providing for needless repairs, let's try to encourage our young people to take PRIDE in their schools and public buildings, by rewarding them for their good sense of responsibility.

Hence . . . Project PRIDE.

GOALS

Briefly, this program aims to:

* Develop a sense of pride within the students themselves.
* Teach students that vandalism costs money.
* Have students take more responsibility in the care and cleanliness of their schools and school grounds.
* Provide a potential source of funds for students' councils.
* Ensure that property, damaged by vandalism, is repaired immediately.
* Prevent the spread of vandalism.
* Keep our school grounds free of litter and garbage.

GUIDELINES

Here's how Project PRIDE works:

Each September 30th, The Lakehead Board of Education will establish a PRIDE account for each elementary and secondary school within its jurisdiction. The budget allocation will be $2.00 per secondary student, and $1.50 per elementary student officially enrolled as of that date.

The Superintendent of Business will supply each school with its own code number and the procedures required to charge items to their PRIDE account.

All repairs resulting from vandalism will be charged to that particular school's PRIDE account. These will include:

* Repairing all broken glass.
* Replacing broken furniture, lockers, equipment, etc.
* Painting and repairing wall defacing.
* All other repairs due to any acts of vandalism.
* Labour costs involved in cleaning up school grounds.
* External vandalism up to $300 per occurrence.

All such charges will include material and labour costs as well.

Whatever monies remain in the PRIDE account as of June 1st, will be turned over to the Students' Council. That group, in consultation with the Principal and Staff Advisor, will determine how the PRIDE dollars will be spent. In elementary schools, where there is no students' council, a representative group of students, in consultation with the Principal, will make the decision.

Obviously, the less damage done to the school during the year, the more money the students will have available.

30

PROJECT PRIDE*

HERE'S YOUR CHANCE TO GET INVOLVED

WHAT IS IT?

An opportunity for students to assist in reducing vandalism.

WHO IS INVOLVED?

Students in all schools of The Lakehead Board of Education.

WHY?

- To develop a sense of pride within the students.
- To increase the awareness in students that vandalism costs money.
- To have students take more responsibility in the care and cleanliness of their school and school grounds.
- To provide a potential financial resource for the students' council.
- To ensure that repairs required as a result of vandalism are completed immediately.
- To prevent the spread of damage to property as a result of vandalism.
- To ensure our school grounds are free of litter and garbage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

- In September, each school will be supplied with a special PRIDE account.
- All repairs as a result of vandalism will be charged to the PRIDE account.
- All money remaining in the PRIDE account as of June 1st will be turned over to the Students' Council.

HERE'S YOUR CHANCE TO GET INVOLVED.

Take PRIDE in the appearance of your School

THE LAKEHEAD BOARD OF EDUCATION

* PUPILS RESPONSIBLE IN DETERMINING THEIR OWN ENVIRONMENT

PROJECT PRIDE

THE LAKEHEAD BOARD OF EDUCATION

Our school has successfully completed

_____

consecutive days without any costly vandalism or litter.

Our PRIDE account contains

$

_____

We take PRIDE in our School!

82

78